

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| 09/941,780 | 08/30/2001 | Takeo Tsukamoto | 35.C15727 | 7587 | |
| 5514 | 7590 05/17/2005 | EXAM | EXAMINER | | |
| FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA | | | VU, DAVI | VU, DAVID HUNG | |
| | NEW YORK, NY 10112 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| , | | | 2828 | | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 05/17/2005 | DATE MAILED: 05/17/2005 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | ASI | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
| | | 09/941,780 | TSUKAMOTO, TAKEO | | |
| | Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| | | David Vu | 2828 | | |
| Period fe | The MAILING DATE of this communication apor Reply | pears on the cover sheet with the | correspondence address | | |
| THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failt Any | MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. In SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statuting received by the Office later than three months after the mailing led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to bly within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da I will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDON | imely filed ys will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | |
| Status | | | • | | |
| 1)[🛛 | Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 h | March 2005. | | | |
| 2a) <u></u> | | | | | |
| 3) | , | | | | |
| | closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | |
| Disposit | ion of Claims | | | | |
| | Claim(s) is/are objected to. | re withdrawn from consideration. | | | |
| Applicat | ion Papers | | | | |
| 9) | The specification is objected to by the Examine | er. | | | |
| 10)[| The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc | cepted or b) objected to by the | Examiner. | | |
| | Applicant may not request that any objection to the | • | , , | | |
| 11)□ | Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the E | | | | |
| | under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | |
| | - | | N () () | | |
| | Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documen 2. Certified copies of the priority documen 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documen application from the International Burea | ts have been received. ts have been received in Applica prity documents have been receiv | tion No | | |
| * 5 | See the attached detailed Office action for a list | t of the certified copies not receiv | ed. | | |
| | | | | | |
| 844 P | w. \ | | | | |
| Attachmen | • • | 4) M Inter-1 | (DTO 440) | | |
| | ce of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail D | | | |
| 3) 🛛 Infon | mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 or No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/8/04</u> . | | Patent Application (PTO-152) | | |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 14-15, 19-20, 40-41, 44-45, and 60-72 are rejected under 35
 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deguchi et al (of record) in view of the
 American Chemical Society published paper by Rodriguez et al. (of record) and Roach,
 U.S. Pub No 2003/0222560.

Deguchi et al. essentially disclose the claimed invention including carbon fibers (graphenes) on cathode or first electrode 12, 45, second or gate or controlling electrode 15,48; substrate 11,41; light emitting member or phosphor 44 and anode electrode 46 on substrate 42; graphene structure can take cylindrical shape as in carbon nanotube; see, for example, figures 2-3; columns 5-6. Deguchi et al fail to explicitly disclose the plurality of graphenes layered stacked so as not to be parallel or not perpendicular to or in the direction of an axis of the fiber on the cathode, and the graphenes extending in a direction intersecting the longitudinal axis of the fiber. Rodriguez et al. disclose a

plurality of graphenes layered not parallel or not perpendicular to or in the direction of an axis direction of the fiber, the graphenes extending in a direction intersecting the longitudinal axis of the fiber (figures 1-2; pages 3863-3864). Roach discloses carbon graphene platelets on field emitter cathode (abstract, [0013-0014, [0022]). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's claimed invention was made to have provided the Deguchi et al reference with the known graphene arrangements on the cathode as taught by Rodriguez et al. and Roach for the purpose of improving electron emission.

Regarding claim 15, figures 1-2 do show the graphenes are substantially parallel to each other.

Regarding claims 19-20, 66-67, 70-71, figure 3 of the Deguchi et al reference shows plurality of electron-emitting devices and light emitting member 44 emits light when irradiated with electrons from the electron-emitting devices. Column 1, lines 5-10, column 15, lines 19-23, does suggest the use of electron emission device in display area; thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have employed an image display in the television as well as in computer field.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 21-34 and 36 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 14-15, 19-20, 40-41, 44-45, and 60-72 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2828

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Vu whose telephone number is (571) 272-1831. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-430pm.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David Vu

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2828

dν